

Appl. No. 10/659,884  
Amdt. Dated November 18, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 05/18/05

Docket No. IS01231AP  
Customer No. 22917

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claims 2 and 10. As such, Claims 2 and 10 have been withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-13 are pending in this application

### Substantive Matters

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meny, et al. (USPN 5,170,326). Claims 3-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Meny, et al. in view of Walles, et al. (USPN 5,925,298).

In an Office Action dated 17 February 2005, the Examiner recognized that Meny lacked the limitation of "a recess or aperture extending outwardly from the inside surface of the substrate to accept the bendable region of the circuit board." In the current Office Action dated 18 May 2005, the Examiner rejects Applicants' invention as being anticipated by Meny when the Examiner previously found Meny to lack the above limitation. What happened?

Regardless, Applicants have amended the independent claims to include a further limitation, namely "the first and second portions of the circuit board and the substrate [being] bent at less than a one hundred eighty degree angle to each other as measured from the inside surface" from originally filed Claims 2 and 10. Applicants make this amendment in order to expedite prosecution of this case because such a limitation is so clearly not described by the prior art (either alone or in combination).

Specifically, the drawings, namely FIGS. 2 and 6, of Meny show an assembly bent by 180 degrees so that the assembly has circuit planes that are parallel. In contrast, Applicants' claims require that "the first and second portions of the circuit board and the substrate are bent at less than a one hundred eighty degree angle to

Appl. No. 10/659,884  
Amdt. Dated November 18, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 05/18/05

Docket No. IS01231AP  
Customer No. 22917

each other as measured from the inside surface." Because this claim limitation is so clearly not described by the prior art, the rejections under Meny should be withdrawn.

Further, rejections under Walles should be withdrawn. Walles is not "analogous prior art" for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue. Walles pertains to bending a circuit board independent of a rigid substrate and not having a rigid substrate is not analogous to the problem of bending while having a rigid substrate. The problem that the Applicants are solving is the problem of reducing kinks in a flexible printed circuit board when it is fixed to a rigid substrate, so the problems and solutions of bending without the rigid substrate are inapplicable to the Applicants. As is known to a person of ordinary skill in the art, the Walles technology is irrelevant to Applicants' invention. Because Walles is not concerned with bending a circuit board when it is fixed to a rigid substrate, Walles is not "analogous prior art" for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue. Since Walles is not "analogous prior art" for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are improper and should be withdrawn.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Indira Saladi  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 45,759

Telephone: 847-576-6735  
Fax No.: 847-576-0721

Attachments